not cover even the expenses of cultivation. The rules did not lay down any well-defined procedure to be adopted by the inspecting officers. He therefore suggested the desirability of appointing respectable ryots as Thadasthers for each village, and said that, if they be asked to work in conjunction with the Government officers in inspecting the lands and deciding whether or not remissions should be granted, it would be a great boon to the ryots.

Dewan's reply.—The grant of *karivu* remission in the Shencottah taluk is now regulated by the following orders, *viz.*, (1) Proclamation dated 22-12-1024; (2) Huzur order dated 29-1-1036; (3) Proclamation dated 14-1-1070; and (4) Proclamation dated 22-12-1070. The rules as they now stand are not defective.

9. *Complaints regarding the settlement of the Kallupara proverthi belonging to the Edappally Chief.*

Mr. K. N. Mamman Mappilla (Member, Thiruvalla Taluk) pointed out that the settlement of the Kallupara proverthy, belonging to the Edappally Chief, was not being conducted on the lines adopted for the settlement of Sirkar lands. He invited attention to the provisions of Sections 2 and 3 of the Estates' Rent Recovery Regulation, IV of 1068, which distinctly laid down that the rights of holders of land under the Edappally Chief were the same as those of the ryots holding Sirkar lands and that the rent recoverable from the former should be assessed at the rates adopted in the case of Sirkar lands. Those principles, which were kept in view at the previous settlements, were not followed at the recent settlement of the proverthy. While, in the case of Sirkar lands, pattas were granted fixing one-fourth the tax as recoverable at the new commutation rate of 11 chs. per para of paddy and the remaining three-fourths at the old vilatharam rate of 6 chs. per para, the ryots holding lands in the proverthy were being compelled to pay one-half the tax at the rate of 11 chs. and the other half at 6 chs. per para of paddy. That was against the spirit of the Regulation and would work great hardship on the ryots. As regards the *tharavila* and value of trees, however, the Sirkar rates, which were more favourable to the Chief, were adopted. It would thus be observed that there was no consistency of procedure or uniformity of principle in the settlement operations as now conducted in the proverthy. He therefore requested that the pattas might be revised in strict conformity with those issued for Sirkar lands, and that, if the Chief would not agree to that course, Government should refuse to collect the tax for the Chief under the Regulation.

Dewan's reply.— The report of the Settlement Peishkar will be called for on the grievances now brought to notice,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

The Member will do well to meet the Peishkar and place before him the matters now alleged.

10. *Exemption of blighted cocoanut trees from taxation.*

Mr. Kanakku Kerulan Govindan (Member, Mavelikara Taluk) represented that the cocoanut plantations formed the main, if not the sole, source of income to the land-owners of the low-lying districts of the State. Within the last decade, the cocoanut blight made considerable havoc among the people, and in spite of the anxious attention paid to the subject by Government by the appointment of special officers to investigate the matter and the publication of their reports, the condition of the cocoanut gardens was growing from bad to worse day by day. The impoverishing effect, together with the increasing spread of the blight, ha deprived many families of their means of livelihood. At present, the proverthies of Thekkekara and Pallikkal in Mavelikara taluk, Krishnapuram and Puthupalli in Karunagapalli taluk and Pathiyur in Kartigapalli taluk were materially affected by the disease and the contagion was gradually spreading to the adjacent areas also. In fact, a circular area of 3 or 4 miles' radius, with Kayenculam as the centre, was subject to the infection. Similar areas at Lalam in Meenachil, Kaviyur in Thiruvalla and some places at Alleppey, were also infected, besides many other isolated parts in the above mentioned taluks and Quilon where also the blight had set in. On an average, from 30 to 50 per cent of the trees was affected at the various centres mentioned. When a tree was attacked by the pest, the fruit became gradually reduced in quantity and quality till at last the tree ceased to bear any fruit at all. Even the fruit that were obtained were not good and would not fetch even half the normal price. The leaves and stem of the tree became sapless and dry. In fact, every item of the yield of the affected tree became deteriorated and useless. The pest could not be attributed to any neglect or indifference on the part of the owners. On the other hand, the land-owners of the affected areas were striving their best to prevent and root out the disease and they would be ever ready to co-operate with the Special Officer in experimenting and adopting remedial measures against the palm disease. The Member expressed regret that, in spite of the best endeavours of the Special Officer, there had been no appreciable improvement so far in the condition of the blight, and that, having regard to the magnitude of the infection and the consequent loss to the ryots, he was forced to approach Government, on behalf of the people, with a prayer that some concession might be shown to the people either by remission or by a reduction of the tax on the affected gardens. He suggested that the department of Agriculture might, after due investigation,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly